

agreed to a request from Platt that Fowler meet with the applicant tribes, even though Platt was “fairly hostile” in the meeting, and that Platt and the tribes never contacted Fowler again.⁴⁹⁸

Platt subsequently called McAuliffe on Sept. 5, when he had Havenick, Ackley and Derickson in his office, and arranged to bring the three over to see McAuliffe. Platt reported that the meeting was quite substantive, and included showing McAuliffe the May 8 O’Connor letter. Platt told investigators that McAuliffe was taken aback by the letter, and commented that the person who wrote the letter was “stupid.”⁴⁹⁹ Platt stated that McAuliffe claimed to not have been involved in the decision, but offered that he would look into the matter. When Platt later contacted McAuliffe, McAuliffe indicated that he could not or would not get involved. Havenick’s memory is that the Sept. 5 meeting was just a chance for McAuliffe to meet the Indians. Havenick said he had not wanted to put McAuliffe on the spot by talking about what McAuliffe had told him in front of the others. In fact, Havenick maintains that he went out of his way to keep the prior McAuliffe conversation to himself.

McAuliffe reported initially that Platt never reached out to him about the Hudson application. After being shown a copy of Platt’s letter of Aug. 18, 1995, McAuliffe said that he had never seen the letter before, but allowed that he could not rule out the possibility that someone might have contacted him about Hudson. He said that he would have listened to the person, and would have done nothing about the matter. Upon further reflection and review of the Aug. 18 letter, McAuliffe believed that Platt might have contacted him about the Hudson issue

⁴⁹⁸Fowler G.J. Test. at 186-89.

⁴⁹⁹OIC Interview of Ronald Platt, May 20, 1999, at 3.